

From: Lois Johnston
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 1:48 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear FCC commissioners, I heard that you are going to be deciding whether to relax regulations on media mergers soon. I hope you will not change the regulations. I believe that large media conglomerates are much less likely to meet the needs of real people than smaller ones. Sincerely, Lois Johnston 2709 W. Broadway Ave. Spokane, Wash. 99201

From: ManaOFarms@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 3:01 AM
Subject: No Subject

Mr. Powell
Aloha.

I know this is against your position regarding limitations on how many radio and tv stations corporations can own, but I want to express my wishes to you that keep safeguards in place to prevent what I believe are monopolies in the media. Keep the independents. It is in the spirit of what has made the things special, individual, in the U.S.
Thank you. Robin Miller

From: Corey Rader
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Apr 5, 2003 2:45 PM
Subject: Please do not LIFT restrictions

Mr. Powell,

I really believe you'd be doing a disservice to your country by lifting the ownership restrictions on our media giants. Ever since the 1996 bill has given total control to Clear Channel, radio markets across the country have become bland water downed corporate sales tools. With the payola system the way it is, it has become impossible for small indepent local stations to compete. I fear that doing the same thing to newspapers and television can be nothing but disasterous. Please reconsider. Think about your legacy, you know if you unleash this it can never be undone!

Corey Rader

1231 Ewing St

Fort Wayne IN 46802

clrader@comcast.net

From: Jody Price
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 7, 2003 2:02 PM
Subject: Program Diversity

Dear Chairman Powell,

Please let this letter serve as my formal complaint and objection to any pending FCC rulings which may lift restriction's on mergers between TV broadcast networks and the number of local TV or radio stations owned by one company. Such deregulation threatens to further stifle the diversity of programming for consumers, advertisers and producers. One of the main charges of the FCC is to promote diversity, which doesn't just refer to people of color, it refers to many different types of programming. We applaud you Commissioner Copps for attempting to draw attention to this problem. I would like to go on record as being opposed to increased or further media deregulation and wish for you to act on my behalf and STOP further media deregulation.

Respectfully yours,
Jody Price
jrpla@earthlink.net

From: Jeff Hansen
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 8, 2003 2:11 PM
Subject: June decision on media mergers

Dear Mr. Powell,

I write this e-mail after watching a program on PBS which concerned a pending June decision allowing more mergers of mega-media corporations and makes it easier for them to buy other smaller independent radio, tv and newspapers. This concerns me greatly as more then a way to make more money this will allow a few to control information, what we see, read and hear and therefore what we think, to be able to manipulate us. It was apparent how you are going to vote on the matter, but let me remind you, it is this very information and from many diverse sources which is the foundation of our democracy. An informed decision of the masses comes only after differing ideas have come forward into the light of public scrutiny where an educated public can make good choices. We are suppose to be the stewards of democracy, it's embarrassing that I along with so many others, listen and watch the BBC for real non propaganda information. We are already manipulated enough by corporations, groups, organizations who would rather us fall in line and think how they wish us to. Clear Channel owns radio, a few mega media corporations own TV and independent newspapers are hard to find. Even if you completely agree with their message I implore you, it is our airways, foster diversity, it is what insures our democratic republic.

Respectfully,
Jeff Hansen

From: Deb Clarke
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 8, 2003 5:34 PM
Subject: Monopolies

Dear Mr.. Powell,

My name is Debra Clarke. I live in Perry, KS. I was under the impression that the communications business was deregulated. Where I currently live the only company that I can get local phone service with is Sprint. I can pick up any long distant carrier that I wish. But for local phone service I am required to be with Sprint. Therefore being new to the area I do not find them very competitive. Why should they be? There is no competition and they know that. I am just curious as to why this is allowed to happen in this small corner of mid west.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Debra M. Clarke
109 Pine
Perry, KS 66073
785-597-5519

From: Mark Miller
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 8, 2003 11:40 PM
Subject: I am not a scientist

but I have an ingrained, personal interest in this country. Please do nothing to further the continuing concentration of our Media. As a democratic nation we must maintain our diversity in viewpoints. Certainly, you can see that now we have a narrowing point of view as a country.

I know alot of money must be at stake but look to the long-term and cripple our ability to have democracy no further. I would love to discuss this with you, even though I am no scientist. Feel free to call me at your convenience at 615-604-6149.

Thank you,
Mark Miller

From: yakman1@uni.edu
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 2:52 PM
Subject: Upcoming Hearing

Mr. Powell:

Hello. My name is Aaron Backlin, and I am a student at the University of Northern Iowa. It has come to my attention that there is an upcoming hearing on petition #2493 in regards to envoking the name of our Lord on public airwaves.

I hope that you realize how ridiculous this is, because if all references to God or the Bible are banned, so will about 15% of cable programming: for cursing... Think about it....

Well, perhaps I'm just cynical. But there is one thing that I want to speak of to you. Freedom of speech is no laughing matter in this nation. Just as we are force fed evolution theory in schools as truth, we see all sorts of things on television that are of questionable nature at best to us of the "religious community". Now, I am not asking for you to ban things like the Victoria's Secret show that seems to cause a ruckus every time it airs. Why? Because I realize that I can CHANGE THE CHANNEL. Or the station. Or better yet, turn off the tube and go... *gasp*... OUTSIDE!

I appologize for they sarcastic nature of this email, but please do not overlook the importance of this case and petition. Keep in mind that there are many of us here at the U of Northern Iowa who feel as I do. This issue is very close to my heart and to the majority of the nation's Christian community. Many are unaware of this petition's existance and of the upcoming hearing.

Please do not allow this petition to go any farther. Atheists, like Christians have every right to simply change the channel. I hope and pray that you point this out to them.

Thank you for your time.
Aaron
Backlin

From: Sandi Spires
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Apr 10, 2003 3:34 PM
Subject: Re: FCC may rescind rules that limit media ownership

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am writing to you to express my support for the rules limiting media ownership. These are good guidelines; they serve the public interest. Keep them in place!

Already the bulk of radio stations are owned by a single company. Not surprising, I find less diversity on the radio today than I found 20 years ago; despite an increase in the number of stations I can reach.

Similarly, despite the 50+ television stations I receive, I find less and less diversity of opinion or programming. When a single company owns various outlets, it does not (as some assert) promote different agendas for each one. Rather, each is limited to a single corporate vision.

Sincerely,
Sandi Spires
Sunnyvale, CA

excerpt below:

The Denver Business Journal - January 13, 2003
<http://denver.bizjournals.com/denver/stories/2003/01/13/newscolumn3.html>

From the January 10, 2003 print edition
Telecom

FCC may rescind rules that limit media ownership

Amy Bryer

...
If the Federal Communications Commission chair, Michael Powell, gets his way, the agency might scrap rules in the next few weeks that restrict the ownership of multiple media outlets in the same market - like the Fox example - and possibly diminish consumer choices for news.
...

(c) 2003 American City Business Journals Inc.

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Osterhout, Megan L
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Apr 11, 2003 3:56 PM
Subject: FCC's Consideration of deregulation

Dear Mr. Powell,

I respectfully ask you to not allow further deregulation of broadcasting companies. As a deejay for Middlebury College's independent college radio station, WRMC 91.1 FM, I feel that I understand the value of diverse and individualized broadcasting. The prospect of further deregulation with regard to the 1996 Telecommunications Act honestly makes me shudder to think that the independent radio that I broadcast and cherish could be taken away and replaced with starkly uniform and homogenously produced shows. Although the FCC's stated job is to promote diversity and competition, I feel that I am in the majority who believe that it is doing quite the opposite.

When I think about my hometown of Pittsburgh, I can only call to mind four or maybe five FM radio stations that were not owned by one of the major broadcasting companies, namely Clear Channel Communications. Even one of the most popular independent radio stations of Pittsburgh, WYEP 91.3, was member supported, it still recieved underwriting, as most independent radio does. One fact that bothered me in particular was that Clear Channel Communications was an underwriting sponsor for WYEP. Clear Channel understood its competition, and still tried to have its name be broadcast over the airwaves to the supporters of independent radio. Though there is certainly nothin illegal about this, and at first it may seem that Clear Channel is in support of independent radio, as its financial resources are being given, it really frightened me to realize that Clear Channel is infiltrating independent, public radio. Obviously it does not support independently produced music; otherwise the major broadcasting companies would play it.

Not only does the FCC have the power to keep further deregulation from happening, I feel that it also has the responsibility to do so. More independent radio means more independent record labels which increases the variety of music and performers that reaches the ears of listeners. I feel that it is every person's right to have access to a wide and varied spectrum of music, news, and programming. I ask you to kindly take my opinion into consideration of further changes in the 1996 Telecommunications Act.

Many thanks for your time,
Megan Osterhout

From: ol_dj@yahoo.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 14, 2003 12:46 PM
Subject: Please end Media Monopolies/Diversity Index

Mr. Powell,

The "diversity index" sounds good, but will it have teeth? For example how would you go about regulating the fact that media industry commentators and pundits that happen to be black completely disappeared from "mainstream" outlets during the coverage of the war in Iraq? What would stop large holding corporations from pulling the plug on diversity of opinion, and that's really what we are talking about here, when controversial issues arise? If Donahue were black and his show was pulled for it's point of view, what would be the FCC's response?

Diversity does not mean putting voices and faces of color on the air for the sole purpose of aesthetics and percentages. If it were, we would already have more diversity and not need to devise an index.

ol_dj@yahoo.com

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Tax Center - File online, calculators, forms, and more
<http://tax.yahoo.com>

From: Rudy
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 6:08 AM
Subject: Upcoming meeting to ease regulations on media ownership

Mr Powell,

Please reconsider any weakening of the already famished regulations the FCC has toward broadcast and media outlet ownership.

Over the past few years since the last loosening of rules the US media consumer has received a more and more homogenized vision of news corresponding more with the huge wealthy corporations that own the media outlets than with the truth.

You may or may not agree but I and many others, who care, have to find other outlets, be they foreign or listener sponsored, to find out the entire picture of what is going on in the world today.

If we want better "entertainment" from media or advertising of products supported by the owners of media conglomerates, easing regulations is the right direction but as it is, news coverage has gotten perilously close to being a corporate, and with this administration in office now, governmental media machine.

At your meeting I suggest you discuss ways to widen the ownership of smaller, listener sponsored stations and media outlets and find ways to regulate the "entertainment" money out of media owned news so a fair and balanced reporting of current events can be found at all stations and in all newspapers in the US unless specifically labeled entertainment.

This is America and it is supposed to be of the people for the people not of the corporation for the corporation.

RP Bacich
Cranford, NJ
mo35x@idt.net

From: Lisa Donadio
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 11:47 AM
Subject: Please halt the June 2 vote on media ownership rules

Dear Commissioners,

I attended a town meeting last night organized by Vermont Congressman Bernie Sanders, and featuring FCC Commissioner Copps. The topic was media ownership, and I was appalled to discover the extent to which consolidation has created, and continues to create, a monopoly in the field of media which threatens local ownership of television, newsprint and radio. More disturbing than that, however, was the revelation that further deregulation was imminent in an upcoming vote at the FCC.

The fact that this issue is one that the majority of people I know (including those who watch or read the news) know NOTHING about is extremely telling. Why is such an important national issue not newsworthy?? I am VERY concerned about the future flow of information in this country.

I was very fortunate to hear about the town meeting that took place last evening; I am employed by a law school, and conscientious students made the community aware of its existence. I DID NOT hear about the meeting on the news, nor have I seen news programs discussing the issue. I feel it is your responsibility at the FCC to take the issue of deregulation to the press so that it reaches a broader audience. I will certainly do my part by spreading word via the internet.

Certainly, you should not hold a vote until a larger percentage of the public has a chance to weigh in on such an important issue.

Thank you for your time,
Lisa Donadio
Randolph, Vermont

Please take immediate action to stop the upcoming vote in the FCC. Although there are countless issues I feel need to be emergently addressed, I honestly feel that this issue, which will affect how the public receives information, is by far the most critical. If the public is unaware of serious issues in the future due to corporate control of the media, the democratic process will fail. No one will know about dangers to the environment, or the state of education, or the increasing numbers of people who fall below the poverty level. How will any of them be addressed?

From: Deanna Sclar
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 1:13 PM
Subject: Free Speech=Non-biased media!

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

Deanna Sclar

Add photos to your e-mail with MSN 8. Get 2 months FREE*.
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/featuredemail>

From: Carol Dain
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 3:00 PM
Subject: diversity in media

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to you today to comment on The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules, Docket No. 02-277. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited. The current invasion of Iraq is a perfect example of these limited views. It saddens me to see report after report, all reflecting the same viewpoint, regardless of the network or channel. Unlike reporting in other parts of the world, there has been very little balance in the views presented in America over this controversial issue. This has clearly influenced many Americans, who strongly support the president on this issue without having all the facts. There is too much control over what is being reported and what is not. I would call this censorship and propaganda except for the fact that it is voluntary on the part of these huge broadcast companies, whose political alliances are clear and very biased. The affects of such reporting over time could be, and may already be detrimental to democracy in America.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised to an even greater extent than it already is.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition to the official hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA, I strongly urge the FCC to hold additional hearings elsewhere around the nation to solicit the widest possible participation from the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of these decisions. I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Respectfully,

Carol Dain
Oak Creek, WI

From: Kristen Blann
To: ::
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 7:04 PM
Subject: Media competition

Dear FCC:

I am extremely concerned about media concentration and the implications for freedom of expression, information, speech, and democracy. 58% of the public relies on General Electric (MSNBC and NBC) News Corp. (Fox), Disney (ABC), AOL-Time Warner (CNN) and Viacom (CBS) for its information. This is far too much power in a democracy for a handful of profit driven companies whose "news" deceives more than it reveals.

Please block any attempts to further "deregulate" the media which will permit even more monopoly consolidation of electronic media than we now have, and further jeopardize our democracy.

I am offended by the abuse of "news" coverage by cable stations, particularly the one-sided drift of the networks to providing propaganda for those in power. Most local cable companies do not include the cable news networks (CNN, FOX and MSNBC) in their "basic" service.

Sincerely,
Kristen Blann

=====

Kristen Blann (klb@fw.umn.edu) PO Box 233 Merrifield, MN 56465
phone: (218)829-3053 fax: (218) 829-5239 cell: (218) 330-9612

We must be prepared to make heroic sacrifices for the cause of peace that we make ungrudgingly for the cause of war. - Einstein

From: Walter I. Zeichner
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 8:15 PM
Subject: NO to further deregulation

I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further this will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, so the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and this will be bad for the US and for the world. Please do not do this.

Thank you.

Walter I. Zeichner
2455 Bolton Notch Rd
Jericho, VT 05465
(802)434-3313
www.walterzeichner.com
www.avoiceforfreedom.net
www.theZfiles.net

From: Walter I. Zeichner
To: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 8:22 PM
Subject: NO to further deregulation

I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further this will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, so the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and this will be bad for the US and for the world. Please do not do this.

Thank you.

Walter I. Zeichner
2455 Bolton Notch Rd
Jericho, VT 05465
(802)434-3313
www.walterzeichner.com
www.avoiceforfreedom.net
www.theZfiles.net

From: Debra Bevill
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps, kjmwebb@fcc.gov, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Apr 15, 2003 11:45 PM
Subject: June 2nd vote

Attn. Commissioner: I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate further this will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, so the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, a less informed public (scary considering how ill informed people are already) and this will be bad for the US and for the world. Please do not do this.

Thank you.
D. Bevill

<http://www.kucinich.us/>

From: Myrna Mincey
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 12:13 AM
Subject: Media Conglomerates

Federal Communications Commission

445 12th Street, SW

Washington, DC 20554

Dear Commissioner:

Regarding the upcoming FCC vote, further consolidation of the media in the false name of "deregulation" must be halted and in fact reversed. TV and radio news in the hands of a handful of profit-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues, most notably the drive to war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to break up the media conglomerates, to open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you,

Myrna Marcarian Mincey
Bloomfield, NJ

From: Elisabeth Hebert
To: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 2:00 AM
Subject: Deregulation

I am aware of the vote scheduled for June 2 on further deregulation of broadcasting ownership. If you vote to deregulate any more, it will do enormous damage to our already beleaguered democracy, putting control of information dissemination into the hands of a few whose motives are profit, not the public interest.

Chairman Powell I urge you to put off this vote for at least 12 months so the issue can be studied, and the public can be informed (commercial media is ignoring the issue totally).

If this deregulation goes through we will see greater voter apathy, and an even less informed public (scary, considering how ill informed people already are). This would be a very bad day for this country. Or is it true that we have exported all our democracy and there is non left for us??? Please consider a vote that proves this thought wrong!

Sincerely,

Elisabeth Hebert
Seattle, WA

Anything that you sincerely believe in, ardently desire, vividly imagine and enthusiastically work upon will inevitably come to pass.

From: Jonathan von Ranson
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 11:18 AM
Subject: June 2 deadline and further deregulation of broadcast ownership

Dear Commissioner,

I don't feel the FCC has done nearly enough to call attention to the issues involved in the further deregulation of broadcast outlet ownership.

If it has, the news hasn't reached the general public or even the opinion makers sufficiently. Maybe you've tried, and the (increasingly centrally-owned) media have chosen to play down the story. If true, that would suggest that deregulation has already gone too far.

In any case, there has been little debate about the pros and cons of this proposal, and I call on you to postpone for a full year a vote on the issue. Meanwhile, I ask you to put a great deal more effort into widespread, travelling hearings on the issue.

Yours truly,

Jonathan von Ranson
6 Lockes Village Rd.
Wendell MA 01379
978 544-3758

From: blowhole@hawaiian.net
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Apr 16, 2003 12:12 PM
Subject: Docket No. 02-277: Support competition, diversity and localism

Dear Chairman Powell,

Any further consolidation of the media under the misnomer of "deregulation" needs to now be stopped and, I believe, reversed.

Television and radio news in the control of a just a few dollar-driven corporations has undermined our democracy more than any other modern force except the high cost of broadcast commercials during elections.

These massive media companies have failed in their public trust to provide crucial unbiased information to the public about most public issues.

Please(!) break up these media conglomerates, and open the spectrum to a wide diversity of organizations and independent journalists, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my concerns.

Best regards,

sanford higinbotham
private mail box 253
post office box 223300
princeville
kauai
hawaii
96722-5342